Appeal: 11-2143 Doc: 14 Filed: 02/13/2012 Pg: 1 of 5

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1983

DON BOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KLLM TRANSPORT SERVICES, INCORPORATED; WELLS MARBLE & HURST, PLLC; ROY H. LIDDELL; KEVIN A. ROGERS; SOUTHEASTERN TRAINING CENTERS, Inc.; DANIEL COKER HORTON, & Bell PA; J. WYATT HAZARD; CAROLYN CURRY SATCHER; J. T. ROBINSON; DAVID L. REDD; W. STAN SULLIVAN; DOE CLERK ONE; DOE CLERK TWO; DOE CLERK THREE; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 11-1990

DON BOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY of COLUMBIA; STATE of SOUTH CAROLINA; GARY H. JOHNSON, II,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 11-1996

DON BOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BI-LO, INCORPORATED; HUNTER & FOSTER PA; LAWRENCE M HUNTER, JR.; SOUTH CAROLINA, STATE OF,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 11-1998

DON BOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WAL-MART STORES, INCORPORATED; WAL-MART SUPERCENTER, INCORPORATED; NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH; CLARENCE DAVIS; AISHA S LUSK; CHRISTOPHER C GENOVESE; SOUTH CAROLINA, STATE OF,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (3:10-cv-03208-JFA; 3:11-cv-00013-JFA; 3:10-cv-03209-JFA; 3:11-cv-00845-JFA)

Appeal: 11-2143 Doc: 14 Filed: 02/13/2012 Pg: 3 of 5

No. 11-2143

In re: DON BOYD,

Petitioner.

No. 11-2144

In re: DON BOYD,

Petitioner.

On Petitions for Writ of Mandamus. (3:10-cv-03209-JFA-PJG;3:11-cv-00845-JFA)

Submitted: February 9, 2012 Decided: February 13, 2012

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Nos. 11-1983, 11-1990, 11-1996, 11-1998, affirmed; Nos. 11-2143, 11-2144, petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Don Boyd, Appellant/Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

We have consolidated six proceedings brought by Don Boyd for consideration, and we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis in all. In case numbers 11-1983, 11-1990, 11-1996, and 11-1998, Boyd appeals the district court's orders adopting the magistrate judge's reports and denying relief on Boyd's claims brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006). We have reviewed the records and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Boyd v. KLLM Transport Servs., No. 3:10-cv-03208-JFA (D.S.C. Aug. 12, 2011); Boyd v. City of Columbia, No. 3:11-cv-00013-JFA (D.S.C. Aug. 12, 2011); Boyd v. Bi-Lo, Inc., No. 3:10-cv-03209-JFA (D.S.C., Aug. 12, 2011); Boyd v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., No. 3:11-cv-00845-JFA (D.S.C. Aug. 12, 2011).

In case numbers 11-2143 and 11-2144, Boyd seeks mandamus relief directing the district court and the magistrate judge in two of the above cases to provide additional citations to the record. We conclude that Boyd is not entitled to the requested relief. Mandamus is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances; it may not be used as a substitute for appeal. Kerr v. United States Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); United States v. Moussaoui, 333 F.3d 509, 516-17 (4th Cir. 2003). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought.

Appeal: 11-2143 Doc: 14 Filed: 02/13/2012 Pg: 5 of 5

<u>In re First Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n</u>, 860 F.2d 135, 138 (4th Cir. 1988). Boyd has not met these standards, and therefore, we deny his petitions for mandamus.

We grant Boyd's motion to have his "mitigative briefs" considered as his informal briefs, but deny his remaining motions, including his motion for waiver of service, his motion to deconsolidate, and his motion to direct the district court to provide him with a certified copy of the record. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court.

Nos. 11-1983, 11-1990, 11-1996, 11-1998:

Nog. 11-2144:

Nos. 11-2143, 11-2144: PETITION DENIED